

REMARKS

Introduction

Upon entry of the foregoing response, claims 1-5 and 8-20 are currently pending in the application. Claims 6 and 7 have been withdrawn from present consideration. Claims 1, 2, 8 and 13-15 have been amended. Support for these amendments is found in the specification, for example, in paragraphs [0025] and [0026]. No new matter is being presented. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are requested.

A telephonic interview between the Examiner and Applicant's representative was held on August 11, 2008. An Interview Summary having a mailing date of August 25, 2008 (copy attached) evidences that interview. No agreement was reached between the parties in the interview of the effect on the claims of the "man pages section 3" paper published by Sun Microsystems and cited by the Examiner, which paper has a publishing date of September 2004 printed on the front page thereof. However, Applicants notes that in the Interview Summary the Examiner admits that the publishing date of the cited paper is subsequent to the filing date of January 16, 2004 of the instant patent application. Thus since the date of the "man pages section 3" paper is prior to the filing date of the instant application, Applicant hereby respectfully objects to the use of that document as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as against the pending claims.

Rejection under 35 USC §101

Claims 15-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection, for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 15 has been amended to address the Examiner's concerns. In view of the amendment to claim 15, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 15, and claims 16-20 which depend therefrom, are directed to statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101 and requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 USC §103

Claims 1-5, 8-12, 15-18 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,892,948 to Aoki et al. (hereinafter "Aoki") in view of a technical manual from Sun Microsystems, Inc., entitled "man pages section 3: Threads and Realtime Library Functions", September 2004 (<http://dlc.sun.com/pdf/817-3944/817-3944.pdf>), lio_listio (hereinafter "Listio"), and allegedly referring to Topics in IRIX® Programming (Chapter 8), dated 1996-2000. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection, for at least the following reasons.

Claim1

Independent claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the invention.

For at least the following reasons, the references cited by the Examiner do not teach or suggest all of the features of the method of claim 1.

Aoki is directed to a method and apparatus for programming support which uses a displayed execution control section having a plurality of display objects (box icons) to visually represent various functions to be applied to a displayed data object (data file icon). (See, the Abstract; col. 2, Ins. 41-51 and col. 8, Ins. 41-55 of Aoki) In Aoki, a user selects the data file icon once by using a drag and drop procedure to move a data object icon to a first function box icon so that a first function associated with the function box icon is performed on the data object. (Id.) If additional function box icons are positioned adjacent to a side of the first function box icon, additional functions may be subsequently applied; however, the data object icon is not reselected to associate a subsequent function to the data object icon. (Id.; and col. 9, Ins. 47-64) Thus, the data object icon is selected only once, and is associated only once with a function box icon.

The Examiner states on page 6 of the Office Action that the data file icon in Aoki is dragged onto a composite function icon, and that it is simply a design choice that the function icon is not dragged to the data file icon "to initiate the composition process." However, the Examiner's statement is unsupported by the description in Aoki. In Aoki there is absolutely no teaching or suggestion of dragging and dropping the data file icon into a function box. Furthermore, even if a function box, or a composite function box, could be dragged to the data

file icon of Aoki, the teaching in Aoki would cause the function, or the composite functions, to execute immediately on the data file (since it is taught in Aoki that the dragging and dropping of the data file into the function box causes the function to execute, presumably without delay).

To immediately execute functions without delay if a function box were dragged and dropped into the data file would defeat a distinct purpose and advantage of the present inventive concept. For the present inventive concept, once the plurality of operations in the present inventive concept are associated with the file display for a file to be executed on the file, the operations do not immediately execute on the file. Execution is deferred. Claim 1 does not require immediate execution of the first and second operations that have been associated with the file to be executed on the file. In fact, as described in the instant patent application at, for example, paragraphs [0005] and [0026], execution of the associated functions is not immediate and might not be carried out until the operations associated with the file are first confirmed for execution. This is a distinct advantage over Aoki.

Aoki illustrates in Figs. 6(A)-(E) a simple visual feature associated with a function box icon regarding whether or not a function associated with the function box icon is currently executing on the data file (or the result of the data file and a prior function is currently executing) by use of a displayed circle icon within a function box icon to indicate current execution of the function of that respective function box icon which displays the circle icon. However, as admitted on page 5 of the Office Action by the Examiner, there is no teaching in Aoki of displaying in a first portion and a second portion of the display of the data file distinct visual features associated with the different operations to be performed on the data file. Additionally, Aoki does not teach or disclose that the data file icon includes a plurality of display portions, each of which represents a distinct visual representation of an operation that has been associated with the data object. Nor, does Aoki teach or suggests how a plurality of display portions for different associated functions associated with each of the different functions would be presented at the data file icon if, as suggested by the Examiner on page 6 of the Office Action, a function box icon of Aoki was dragged and dropped (although not taught or suggested how) into the data file icon.

The Examiner uses Listio (and other documents mentioned in the Interview Summary) to allegedly evidence knowledge in the prior art of which would motivate one of skill in the art to use multiple portions of a file display for a file to visually display and represent a plurality of operations that are simply listed in a line of computer programming code which may be

performed on the file. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Listio is a September 2004 Sun Microsystems manual which simply describes, on page 75 thereof, a realtime library function programming code command identified as the "lio_listio – list directed I/O" function for a Sun Microsystems programming language. The command simply lists in programming code various functions which, depending on flag status and other parameters, may or may not actually be executed on a file listed in the command.

Applicant respectfully submits that it would not be obvious to one skilled in the computer arts after reading Listio to develop a file display, or other type of graphic user interface (GUI), to visually display, in a first and second portion of a file display for a single file, these functions listed in the programming code command which may or may not (depending on the flags and parameters) actually execute on the file listed in the command. Additionally, as described above, Aoki does not teach or suggest displaying in a first portion and a second portion of the display of the data file distinct visual features associated with the different operations to be performed on the data file. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in the combination of Aoki and Listio (or any of the other documents cited by the Examiner) of how a simple listing of operations in a programming command, which may not actually execute on a file listed therein, would teach or suggest displaying in a first portion and a second portion of the display of the data file distinct visual features associated with the different operations to be performed on the data file.

In summary, neither Aoki, Listio nor the other documents referred to by the Examiner in the Interview Summary, separately, or in combination, teaches or suggests, among other things, reselecting a file display for a data file to associate a second operation to be executed on the data file after a first operation has been selected and associated with the data file.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, neither Aoki nor Listio, separately, or in combination, teaches or suggests the method of claim 1 which includes:

- "selecting a first input to apply a first operation to be executed on the single file;
- selecting a file display for the single file on a graphical user interface (GUI) to associate the selected first input with the single file;
- presenting a first distinct visual feature associated with the first operation in a first portion of the file display of the single file;
- selecting a second input to apply a second operation to be executed on the single file;
- reselecting the file display for the single file to associate the selected second input with

the single file; and

presenting a second distinct visual feature associated with the second operation in a second portion of the reselected file display of the single file such that the first distinct visual feature is also being presented,” as currently recited in claim 1. (Emphasis added)

Thus, independent claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Aoki, Listio and the other documents referred to by the Examiner in the Interview Summary (since the other documents were merely cumulative, according to the Examiner, to Listio), and accordingly it is respectfully requested that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn, and allowance of claim 1 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 8

Independent claim 8 has been amended to more clearly define the invention.

For at least the reasons given above in regard to independent claim 1, neither Aoki, Listio nor the other documents referred to by the Examiner in the Interview Summary, separately, or in combination, teaches or suggests, a computer system which includes:

“an input device for selecting the file display for the single file in the GUI in a first instance after engaging a first input and reselecting the file display for the single file in a second subsequent instance after engaging a second input from the plurality of inputs, wherein a first operation to be applied for execution on the single file is associated with the first input and a second operation to be applied for execution on the single file is associated with the second input, and wherein a first portion of the file display of the single file presents a first distinct visual feature associated with the first operation, and wherein a second portion of the file display of the single file presents a second distinct visual feature associated with the second operation,” as currently recited in claim 8. (Emphasis added)

Thus, independent claim 8 is patentably distinguishable over Aoki, Listio and the other documents referred to by the Examiner in the Interview Summary (for the reasons given above in regard to claim 1), and accordingly it is respectfully requested that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn, and allowance of claim 8 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 15

Independent claim 15 has been amended to more clearly define the invention.

For at least the reasons given above in regard to independent claim 1, neither Aoki, Listio nor the other documents referred to by the Examiner in the Interview Summary, separately, or in combination, teaches or suggests, a computer program product which includes:

“computer program code for selecting a first input to apply a first operation for execution on the single file;

computer program code for selecting a file display for the single file on a graphical user interface (GUI) to associate the selected first input with the single file;

computer program code for presenting a first distinct visual feature associated with the first operation in a first portion of the file display of the single file;

computer program code for selecting a second input to apply a second operation for execution on the single file;

computer code for reselecting the file display for the single file to associate the selected second input with the single file; and

computer program code for presenting a second distinct visual feature associated with the second operation in a second portion of the reselected file display of the single file such that the first distinct visual feature is also being presented,” as currently recited in claim 15.

(Emphasis added)

Thus, independent claim 15 is patentably distinguishable over Aoki, Listio and the other documents referred to by the Examiner in the Interview Summary (for the reasons given above in regard to claim 1), and accordingly it is respectfully requested that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn, and allowance of claim 15 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 2-5, 9-12, 16-18 and 20

Regarding dependent claims 2-5, 9-12, 16-18 and 20, since these claims depend from independent claim 1, 8 or 15, they include all of the features of the respective independent claim from which they depend, as described above. For at least the reasons given above regarding independent claims 1, 8 and 15, there is no teaching or suggestion in Aoki, Listio and the other documents referred to by the Examiner in the Interview Summary, separately or in combination, of all of the features of these dependent claims. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 2-

Serial No.: 10/759,932
Docket No.: RPS920030846US1
Reply to the Office Action of July 11, 2008

5, 9-12, 16-18 and 20 are patentably distinguishable over Aoki, Listio and the other documents referred to by the Examiner in the Interview Summary. Accordingly it is respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn, and allowance of claims 2-5, 9-12, 16-18 and 20 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 13, 14 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoki in view Listio as applied to independent claims 1, 8 and 15 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0114265 to Talbert (hereinafter "Talbert"). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection, for at least the following reasons.

Regarding dependent claims 13, 14 and 19, since these claims depend from amended independent claim 8 or 15, they include all of the features of the independent claim from which they respectfully depend, as described above. For at least the reasons given above regarding independent claims 8 and 15, there is no disclosure, teaching or suggestion in Aoki, Listio and the other documents referred to by the Examiner in the Interview Summary, separately or in combination, of all of the features of these dependent claims. Furthermore, the portions of Talbert cited by the Examiner do not overcome the deficiencies of Aoki, Listio and the other documents referred to by the Examiner in the Interview Summary, nor was Talbert cited by the Examiner for that purpose.

Therefore, for at least the reasons given above, claims 13, 14 and 19 are patentably distinguishable over Aoki, Listio, and Talbert, and the other documents referred to by the Examiner in the Interview Summary (for the reasons given above in regard to claim 1), separately or in combination. Accordingly it is respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn, and allowance of claims 13, 14 and 19 is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, there being no other objections or rejections, this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Serial No.: 10/759,932
Docket No.: RPS920030846US1
Reply to the Office Action of July 11, 2008

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

No extension of time for this response is believed to be necessary. However, in the event an extension of time is required, that extension of time is hereby requested. Please charge any fee associated with an extension of time, as well as any other fee necessary to further the prosecution of this application, to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0447.

Respectfully submitted,

DILLON & YUDELL, LLP

Dated: Sept 11, 2008
8911 N. Capital of Texas Hwy, Suite 2110
Austin, TX 78759
Telephone: (512) 343-6116

By: Joseph W. King
Joseph W. King
Registration No. 35, 768